Natia Zardiashvili

HUMOUR AND EMOTIONAL SETTING IN PUBLIC SPEAKING

Abstract

Studying emotion is not an easy task due to a great number of controversial theories and hypotheses about the issue. For instance, James-Lange theory discusses emotion as a result of arousal and a physiological reaction on certain events; (James 1884); Cannon-Bard theory, (Cannon, W. 1987) on the other hand, suggests that emotions are physiological reactions and that emotion and arousal occur simultaneously. Appraisal theories (Moors et al. 2013; Scherer 2009) state that appraisals of situations cause emotional reactions. Other researchers debate on the universality of emotion words and argue about basic emotion terms. (Izard 2007; Wierzbicka, 1986)

This article, however, focuses on humorous elements that speakers utilise to create a certain emotional background in the audience. For this, the data from 5 public speeches taken from Ted.com platform are analysed. In addition, the usage of humour and its role in creating an overall emotional background is also discussed. As an analytical framework, the article employs the framing theory (Minsky 1974; Fillmore 1976) and identifies humour in the clash of non-related frames. Current analysis suggests that speakers use non-related frames to change the meaning of the utterance and therefore result in a humourous effect that in a broader context creates an emotional setting.

Keywords: Framing; Emotion; Humour;

1. Introduction

In the contemporary world, people constantly face situations with implicit messages and experience a need to correctly decode them. This becomes especially hard when an emotional response is to be provided or listeners are influenced emotionally.

Amongst many interesting questions, the following are the ones that attract the attention of researchers: do there exist basic emotions and if so, how can we be sure that they are universal for all languages around the world? Wierzbicka argues that emotion terms constitute a folk taxonomy and therefore they cannot be used as analytical frameworks for research. Hence, if we want to distinguish universal human emotions we have to identify them with the semantic metalanguage that has to be culture-oriented and language-independent. (Wierzbicka 1986:584-585). This discussion implies that semantics of the emotion terms should be analysed by means of primitives that are common in every language and lexical resources. Therefore, when speaking about universal emotions, one should bear in mind that not every culture may have similar concepts for them. Another interesting question concerns societies and cultures. Namely, do they perceive emotional message identically or what role does a culture play in studying emotions and emotional responses? This question concentrates on the anthropological aspects of the issue. Besnier emphasises the importance of cultural differences in emotion conceptualisation and discusses how different societies in different discourses use and express emotions, for example, political discourse uses persuasive language as a moralising element. Some cultures may express emotional processes through somatic metaphors, others understand and express emotions as internal events and do not associate them with physical states. (Besnier 1990:421-423).

In the article, framing theory is used to study how speakers emotionally influence the audience using humorous elements and cultural frames. As Fillmore states, the concept of frame is language independent (Fillmore 1976), thus it perfectly fits the above mentioned two criteria for emotion study introduced by Wierzbicka (1986). Specifically, Wierzbicka believes that emotions have to be identified by culture oriented and language independent metalanguage. However, although Wierzbicka does not define particular emotions through frames, it tries to give insight into the logic behind the speakers' usage of humour as a means of emotional influence on the audience. Humour is analysed by means of the semantic frames theory (Fillmore 1976), it concentrates on the sentence level rather than larger units, whilst the second approach (Minsky 1974) utilized in the article focused on framing greater units, like paragraphs and texts, and was employed to study cultural frames.

2. Methodology

Five recordings from Ted.com platform with a total duration of 72.02 minutes were analysed utilising the frame analysis and Fillmore's semantic frames theory. Entman defines frames as "scattered conceptualisations" used to transfer information from a sentence or a word to consciousness (Entman 1993:51-52). Frame semantics theory is represented by the FrameNet project, an online lexical database for frames based in the International Computer Science Institute in Berkeley since 1997. Its framework was adopted in different countries and similar FrameNet databases were created in Japan, Brazil, Germany, France, etc. In this article, specific phrases, words, and episodes that evoked emotional reactions were marked in the speeches and analysed with the help of the FrameNet database. The emotional reaction was expressed by laughter, applause or other non-verbal expressions. The methodology of frame analysis was also employed to distinguish cultural frames and investigate their importance and role in creating emotional influence on the audience.

While analysing data two different approaches were taken into account. The foundation for one of them was the theory of semantic frames. Humorous utterances were taken out from transcripts for further analysis and using FrameNet database, frames were singled out and checked in the data to see whether any of them revealed subframe relationships. Thus this method concentrated on the sentence level and was more verb-oriented, implying that in the majority of cases verbs were the frame carriers.

The other approach aimed at the analysis of more complex structures than sentences, namely discourses. Minsky's theory (Minsky 1974) was taken as the theoretical framework for this approach. It concentrated on the whole discourse and instead of frame evoking words, examined the overall ideas of the discourses referred to as cultural frames.

The first approach was used to study the usage of humour and to distinguish humorous element in an utterance. Being sentence oriented, this approach was used to study why listeners found humorous messages funny. For example:

Do schools kill creativity?

(https://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_says_schools_kill_creativity/transcript#t-834691)

If my wife is cooking [cooking_creation] a meal at home, which is not often ... thankfully [Judgment_direct_address].

This sentence is humorous because we have the opposition of two non-related frames, coocking_creation frame, and Judgment_direct_address frame. According to the FrameNet database, coocking_creation frame describes food and meal preparation. A Cook creates a Produced_food from (raw) Ingredients. The Heating_instrument and/or the Container may also be specified. (https://framenet2.icsi.berkeley.edu/fnReports/data/frameIndex.xml?frame=Cooking_creation)

In Judgment_direct_address frame, a Communicator judges the Addressee and then communicates that appraisal directly to the Addressee. The judgment is given for a particular Reason or about a particular Topic. (https://framenet2.icsi.berkeley.edu/fnReports/data/frameIndex.xml?frame=Judgment_direct_address)

In the example cooking is judged negatively by the speaker, the reason for this being the wife's bad skills in it. This results in laughter because instead of logical continuing of the meaning that wife cooks food and the family enjoys it, we have the change in meaning achieved by employing Judgment_direct_address frame.

The second approach concentrated on the contextual level and is expressed by discussing cultural frames. For this part of the research, the full transcripts of the speeches were taken and analysed to distinguish the main messages the speaker wanted to communicate to the audience. These messages were delivered to the audience through cultural frames. Cultural frames were developed on the basis of the main thematic idea of the speech. For example, in the speech - *Beautiful new words to describe obscure emotion* - the speaker discusses the words and how they acquire meanings. While delivering his message he uses the cultural frame – "Who I am? Where I go? "- that is expressed in the following example:

But in reality, we're all the main characters, and you yourself are an extra in someone else's story. ….So it made them feel less alone.

(https://www.ted.com/talks/john_koenig_beautiful_new_words_to_describe_obscure_emotions)

The frame is expressed through the idea that if you are important you are never alone. In order to find these cultural frames the main ideas of the speeches were analysed. These ideas can be understood as cultural frames.

2.1 Data collection

Speeches used in the article are available online on Ted.com platform with full transcriptions which makes it easy to extract data for further analysis. The reason for selecting Ted.com speeches is that they were prepared and constructed in advance with the aim to influence listeners emotionally. Consequently, it was interesting to investigate how speakers used humour intentionally and which cultural frames were used to guide listeners to the desired path of emotions.

The following speeches were analysed in the data of the article:

(Last visited: 05/24/2019)

1. Beautiful new words to describe obscure emotions;

(https://www.ted.com/talks/john_koenig_beautiful_new_words_to_describe_obscure_emotions)

2. How great leaders inspire action;

(https://www.ted.com/talks/simon_sinek_how_great_leaders_inspire_action)

3. The hidden power of smiling;

(https://www.ted.com/talks/ron_gutman_the_hidden_power_of_smiling)

4. The power of introverts;

(https://www.ted.com/talks/susan_cain_the_power_of_introverts)

5. Do schools kill creativity;

(https://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_says_schools_kill_creativity)

3. Framing emotion

Frame semantics theory was developed by Charles J. Fillmore and it grew into a FrameNet project – an online lexical resource for English that operates since 1997. Frames can be understood as story fragments which connect a group of words to their meanings. Therefore, all our knowledge is stored in frames and is activated in suitable contexts. (Ruppenhofer, J., Ellsworth, M., Petruck, M. R., Johnson, C. R., & Scheffczyk, J. 2016:7). This online database uses the term "lexical unit" to refer to the word and its meaning. Each lexical unit belongs to a certain frame. Apart from frames, it also distinguishes between the frame elements which are expressed through different roles in the situation. For example, the following sentence is analysed according to the semantic frames theory::

I *[the cook]***cooked** a dinner *[produced_food]*;

The frame- evoking word in this sentence is the verb "cooked" which evokes the cooking_creation frame. This common situation involves two roles which are also distinguished in the sentence: the cook and the produced food. These two are referred to as frame elements. (Ruppenhofer, J., Ellsworth, M., Petruck, M. R., Johnson, C. R., &Scheffczyk, J. 2016)

Frames may express semantic relationships. The relationship this article focuses on is that of the subframes, which implies that separate frames (subframes) are related to complex frames via the subframe relations. According to the FrameNet project, for example, Criminal_process frame has the following subframes: arrest, arraignment, trial, sentencing, appeal. (Ruppenhofer, J., Ellsworth, M., Petruck, M. R., Johnson, C. R., & Scheffczyk, J. 2016:83-84). In this article, I concentrate on subframe relationships between frames and presume that non-related frames (i.e frames without the subframe relationships with one another) are used by the speakers to introduce humorous elements in their speeches.

Fillmore's semantic frames theory is more concentrated on the sentence level and is definitely verb oriented. This is logical as both the sentence and its meaning are constructed around the verb. However, if we speak about larger units, like paragraphs or discourses, these verb oriented frames may fade away or completely disappear. According to Minsky, the frame of one sentence can become

subsidiary in a larger story-frame. (Minsky, 1974:26) For example, let us take the speech "The hidden power of introverts", discussed below (see Example 1). In one of the humorous utterances, we have the opposition of frames "custom" and "being_detached". These frames are only important on the sentence level to see why this particular sentence is funny. However, in the context of the whole speech, these two frames become less important. There can be a number of frames used in separate sentences, but for the whole paragraph or text, there may be completely different two or three frames. For instance, in the mentioned speech, the main frame that defines the tone and overall meaning is "Who I am, Where I go". However, we don't see this frame throughout every sentence in the speech. Thus the article concentrates not only on semantic frame theory, but also uses Minsky's understanding of frames as bigger units that may carry out the idea of the paragraph or the whole speech.

Using humour in discourse is another interesting issue to investigate the ways speakers manage to influence listeners. Raskin's verbal humour theory focuses on semantic mechanisms of humour and portrays it as an extra-linguistic context of the linguistic unit. (Raskin 1979:325) The major goal of the researcher was to create a theoretical framework that would fit in a humorous context. For this, Raskin used the theory of scripts (also called frames) defined as the structures built in the mind of the speaker, used to describe standard routines and processes. As for the humorous element, it can be understood as the clash of opposite and non-relational frames. The text reveals a humorous element if the represented frames are not related in nature, but at the same time, as Raskin states (Raskin 1979: 332), all frames should be compatible with the text. (Raskin 1979:325) To illustrate this argument, let us take a look at example 2 given down below. It reveals a camping frame, which can be briefly illustrated as follows:

Camping:

Subject: [Adults] [Children]

Activity: Socialising

=children come to camps to meet new people

=children participate in social and group activities

=children learn leadership skills

=Group leaders monitor their achievements and social activities

Place: Countryside

Time: Summer/Winter   **Time**: any time

Condition: Face to face   **Condition**: Alone

Reading activity:

Subject: [Person]

Activity: Reading

= Person reads a book, article etc.

Place: Home, school, café, countryside

Both of these frames can be compatible in the text because the logical frame of the utterance is not violated as both frames have similar elements. However, at the same time they are not related through subframe relationship. To make it clearer let us see what happens if we change the places of frames:

*(1) And I had this idea that **camp** was going to be just like this, (**reading**) but better.-*

*(2) And I had this idea that **reading** was going to be just like this, (**camp**) but better.*

The (1) is the original text the speaker used. He uses the camping frame that is changed in the (2) with a reading frame but, as we can see, both variations can be meaningful and understandable.

Overall, humour unites the speaker and the audience into one emotional setting. Izard argues that "emotion feeling at some level of intensity is always present in consciousness, influencing appraisals and other cognitive and non-cognitive activators of the sequence of emotions felt in the stream of consciousness." (Izard, 1992:562) Following this argument, it can be claimed that experiencing emotion is subjective and is influenced by the unconscious emotional background of the individual. It is also worth noting that due to the fact that this emotional background depends on consciousness, it

acquires meaning only after some relevant experience that influences the adequacy of the specific emotion. For example, if celebrations, such as birthday parties, are associated with negative memories and experiences, their framing will evoke negative emotions. This suggests that similar situations can result in different emotions not only throughout cultures but also amongst individuals within the culture. In broader contexts, we can speak about the role of the ideas as frames that influence a listener's emotional attitude towards various contexts and situations. These ideas can be culturally implemented in societies and understood as cultural frames. Loseke borrows Jeffrey Alexander's term "symbolic codes" in his article (Loseke 2009:500) and also distinguishes cultural codes that are close to the term "cultural frames" used in this article. In the term "cultural frame" I imply the code of behavior shared by the members of the culture and therefore these non-written "rules" determine our actions and feelings in different contexts. Loseke also argues that cultural ways of experiencing emotions do not determine the subjective nature of emotions and perceives the culture as a tool of a set of resources. Therefore, rhetoric is emotionally persuasive by using symbolic codes and accompanying emotion codes. (Loseke 2009:500-501).

Another debatable issue concerns the belief that there exist basic emotion terms (Johnson-Laird and Oatle 1989:82). While discussing the subjectivity of emotions, it must be remembered that for each representative of a culture, perception of the emotion would depend on the subjective experience, and thus we cannot speak about the universal nature of emotions. Here we do not imply different intensities of emotional experience but look at the problem from the perspective of semantics. According to Wierzbicka (1999:3-4), emotion is connected to cognition and because of human nature, each culture categorises emotions. As well as this, these categorisations are influenced by and depend on the lexical network of the specific language. If categorising emotions is a culturally conditioned process, the role of the cognitive appraisal in the perception of emotion should also be taken into account. If we discuss the issue from this point of view, it will lead to cultural framing, because each person evaluates the situation cognitively, according to his/her own experiences. Nevertheless, one can always discuss the truthfulness of emotions. Lakoff and Johnson state that the human conceptual system is based on metaphors and as the truth is always relevant to the conceptual system, there is no truly objective truth. At some point, truth is always subjective in nature. (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:185). From this

argument, it can also be assumed that similarly, emotions can never be truly objective. Therefore, universal emotions depend on universal ideas that are determined by cultural frames or concepts.

Johnson-Laird and Oatley believe that human emotion depends on a prototype. Members of the same culture employ different prototypes in different contexts. But there is no prototype to express subjective emotions because they are understood as an unanalysed primitive experiences. (Johnson-Laird and Oatley 1989:83) This argument about prototypes can be paralleled to frame semantics theory, where instead of prototypes, we speak about frames and their lexical units. Lexical units evoke frames, hence if sadness is a lexical unit, it represents one of the elements of many other units grouped under the frame.

Despite the angle we choose to discuss the problem, whether prototypes or semantic frames, it is important to note the idea that emerges throughout works of a number of linguists (Whorf, Humboldt, Wierzbicka and so on). This is the opinion that language determines the way the world is perceived. Thus, emotion cannot be studied from a psychological standpoint. If emotion is the result of the conceptual idea, then we should also determine the role of culture in it. We can assume that emotions are perceived differently in different cultures. Therefore, lexical units that are used to evoke emotions can be different not only from the point of view of the context but they can also represent culturally different varieties. (Wierzbicka 1999:24-26) This discussion, of course, doesn't mean that we cannot trace universal elements between languages, because there can be found natural elements that are independent of language and culture. As stated by Wierzbicka, in other aspects, for instance, in emotion or value categorisations, huge differences can be observed. (see Wierzbicka and Andor 2009:316)

In the examples given below, the speakers use non-related frames to load the text with a humorous element.

Example N1 (**https://www.ted.com/talks/ron_gutman_the_hidden_power_of_smiling**)

*In studies conducted in Papua New Guinea, Paul Ekman, the world's most renowned researcher on facial expressions, found that even members of the Fore tribe, who were completely **disconnected***

from Western culture, and also known for their unusual cannibalism **rituals**, *(Laughter) attributed smiles to descriptions of situations the same way you and I would. So from Papua New Guinea to Hollywood, all the way to modern art in Beijing, we smile often and use smiles to express joy and satisfaction.*

In this extract, laughter is caused by using the frame of "being_ detached" which is opposed to the frame of "custom". Laughter is based on the juxtaposition of the images of westerners over the Fore tribe. As soon as this superiority is connected to the "custom" frame, it results in laughter, because it emphasises the opinion concerning the huge difference in cultural development between the two opposed societies. As well as this, the speaker uses another frame – "facial expression" to fully communicate the idea, that although being very different, these tribes are still similar to westerners in their attribution of smile.

Example N2 (**https://www.ted.com/talks/susan_cain_the_power_of_introverts**)

- *When I was nine years old, I went off to summer camp for the first time. And my mother packed me a suitcase full of books, which to me seemed like a perfectly natural thing to do, because in my family, reading was the primary group activity. And this might sound antisocial to you, but for us, it was really just a different way of being social. You have the animal warmth of your family sitting right next to you, but you are also free to go roaming around the adventure land inside your own mind. And I had this idea that camp was going to be just like this, but better. (laughter)*

In this example, the speaker uses a number of frames characterizing a certain way of free time activities: reading_activity (reading); social_event (social); Social_interaction_evaluation (animal warmth); self_motion (roaming), and opposes them to the awareness frame (idea) implying the similarity between the two different types of activities, in this case, reading and camp activities. The humorous element arises due to the completely opposite meanings between the two abovementioned ways of spending time.

Through opposing non-relational frames, the meaning of the utterance changes. Based on the clash in different meanings, it results in laughter that can be understood as humorous. In 5 speeches analysed in this article, humour was employed as the means to connect with the audience and to create emotional setting for the main idea of the speech.

Another aspect that the article concentrates on, apart from humour, is the cultural framing which along with humour creates an emotional setting. Therefore, the main ideas that represent cultural frames were singled out. These examples express different concepts than illustrated above, in that they are frames carried out not by one word, but the whole paragraphs and speeches. Unlike semantic frames, this types of frames are not concentrated on sentence level and represent bigger units of the text.

1. Human is the center of the world. *Beautiful new words to describe obscure emotions;*

(https://www.ted.com/talks/john_koenig_beautiful_new_words_to_describe_obscure_emotions)

E.g. Because remember, words are not real. They don't have meaning. We do.

This frame was present in most of the speeches and was used to motivate the audience and bring them to the state of the type of awareness when there is no other true reality rather than the one presented by the speaker. It created the intimacy and made people believe in the words the speaker used as the frame evoked the feeling of usefulness.

2. I am important therefore I am not alone; *Beautiful new words to describe obscure emotions;*
(https://www.ted.com/talks/john_koenig_beautiful_new_words_to_describe_obscure_emotions)

E.g....But in reality, we're all the main characters, and you yourself are an extra in someone else's story. ....So it made them feel less alone. That's the power of words, to make us feel less alone.

This frame stresses the need in people to be socially useful and important and plays on the themes of self-love and self-acceptance that itself is connected with the feeling of usefulness.

3. Who I am? Where I go? *The power of introverts;*

(https://www.ted.com/talks/susan_cain_the_power_of_introverts)

E.g. I mean: What's your purpose? What's your cause? What's your belief? Why does your organization exist? Why do you get out of bed in the morning? And why should anyone care? As a result, the way we think, we act, the way we communicate is from the outside in, it's obvious. We go from the clearest thing to the fuzziest thing. But the inspired leaders and the inspired organizations -- regardless of their size, regardless of their industry --, all think, act and communicate from the inside out.

What is the purpose of life? By using this frame speakers play on the essence of life and purpose and emotionally influence audience to become more motivated and therefore trustful to the speaker and to the implied message.

4. Do what you believe in; *How great leaders inspire action;*

(https://www.ted.com/talks/simon_sinek_how_great_leaders_inspire_action)

E.g."I believe, I believe, I believe," he told people. And people who believed what he believed took his cause, and they made it their own, and they told people.

This frame inspires the listeners and plays with different emotions that motivate people for the future actions with the message that everything is possible.

These four ideas represent the main values of the society they have been used for. By using these ideas public speakers managed to deliver the emotional message simultaneously to each and everyone in the audience. This is the mechanism that we also refer to as *cultural framing*. Each culture has its own sets of rules and values and therefore the differences between cultures are represented on different

levels of social life. In order to communicate efficiently, whether it is a humorous message or not, it is vital to know the moral values of the society, to decode frames, audience needs to connect with the speaker to identify his reality with the speaker's and vice versa. But this, of course, doesn't mean that all the emotions are determined by culture. However, when it comes to persuasive communication and rhetoric, it is important to know which cultural frames to use to gradually construct the same reality with your audience.

4. Findings and discussion

The number of occasions of use of humour by the speaker was distributed as follows:

1. Beautiful new words to describe obscure emotions – 8;

2. How great leaders inspire action – 3;

3. The hidden power of smiling – 9;

4. The power of introverts – 9;

5. Why do schools kill creativity – 16;

Humour creates a feeling of enjoyment that is expressed by smiles or laughter. (Beeman, 1999:103) Expressions containing humour were used as a means to overcome the obstacle between the audience and the speaker. Humour defused tension and the speakers and the listeners switched to the same emotional setting. Following the humorous elements, speakers tried to introduce the main points or the problems of the issue covered in the speech. For example: in the speech - Do schools kill creativity? Which has the highest number of laughter compared with the other speeches, we see how the speaker changes the tone of his speech from using humour to communicating the idea and this cycle continues throughout the speech. Take a look at the following extract: From 6:22 to 8:10 the speaker continuously uses humorous elements and then communicates the idea. From observing the audience and the speaker it is visible that the funnier the joke the more sensitive and important it made the issue for the listeners. This was achieved by creating the sharp contrast between humour and its carefree character on the one hand, and the problem itself and its seriousness on the other.

Example 3. Do schools kill creativity

(https://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_says_schools_kill_creativity/transcript)

*6:22 Actually, we lived in a place called Snitterfield, just outside Stratford, which is where Shakespeare's father was born. **Are you struck by a new thought?** I was. **You don't think of Shakespeare having a father, do you? Do you? Because you don't think of Shakespeare being a child, do you?** Shakespeare being seven? I never thought of it. I mean, he was seven at some point. **He was in somebody's English class, wasn't he?***

*06:43 **(Laughter)***

06:50 How annoying would that be?

*06:52 **(Laughter)***

06:59 "Must try harder."

*07:01 **(Laughter)***

07:05 Being sent to bed by his dad, to Shakespeare, "Go to bed, now!" To William Shakespeare. "And put the pencil down!"

*07:11 **(Laughter)***

07:12 "And stop speaking like that."

*07:13 **(Laughter)***

07:17 "It's confusing everybody."

*07:18 **(Laughter)***

07:23 Anyway, we moved from Stratford to Los Angeles, and I just want to say a word about the transition. Actually, my son didn't want to come. I've got two kids; he's 21 now, my daughter's 16. He didn't want to come to Los Angeles. He loved it, but he had a girlfriend in England. This was the love of his life, Sarah. He'd known her for a month.

*07:46 **(Laughter)***

07:47 Mind you, they'd had their fourth anniversary, because it's a long time when you're 16. He was really upset on the plane. He said, "I'll never find another girl like Sarah." And we were rather pleased about that, frankly –

*07:59 (**Laughter**)*

08:07 because she was the main reason we were leaving the country.

*08:10 (**Laughter**)*

*08:16 But something strikes you when you move to America and travel around the world: **every education system on earth has the same hierarchy of subjects. Every one. Doesn't matter where you go.** You'd think it would be otherwise, but it isn't. At the top are mathematics and languages, then the humanities. At the bottom are the arts. Everywhere on earth. And in pretty much every system, too, there's a hierarchy within the arts. Art and music are normally given a higher status in schools than drama and dance. There isn't an education system on the planet that teaches dance every day to children the way we teach them mathematics. Why? Why not? I think this is rather important. I think math is very important, but so is dance. Children dance all the time if they're allowed to, we all do. We all have bodies, don't we? Did I miss a meeting?*

*08:59 (**Laughter**)*

*09:02 **Truthfully, what happens is, as children grow up, we start to educate them progressively from the waist up. And then we focus on their heads. And slightly to one side.***

Apart from creating the emotional setting which implied the higher degree of problem perception, it was manipulated by the speakers by using cultural frames that evoked different emotions depending on the topic of the speech. By using humour, speakers became more of an insider in the large group of people and in the end, both of their realities were merged into one reality that the speaker wanted the listeners to see. To this, we add cultural frames that carried the overall emotional influence on people and resembled the moral values and ethics of a society.

The study of the data reveals that speakers try to influence the audience using humour constructed by non-related frames. The role of using humour was to overcome social boundaries and to become the inner member of the audience community for the purpose to intensify the alertness towards the main issue expressed in the speech. Consider following extracts:

Example 4.

Do schools kill creativity?

(https://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_says_schools_kill_creativity/transcript)

00:02 Good morning. How are you?

00:04 (Audience) Good.

00:06 It's been great, hasn't it? I've been blown away by the whole thing. In fact, I'm leaving.

00:12 (Laughter)

00:18 There have been three themes running through the conference, which are relevant to what I want to talk about. One is the extraordinary evidence of human creativity in all of the presentations that we've had and in all of the people here; just the variety of it and the range of it. The second is that it's put us in a place where we have no idea what's going to happen in terms of the future. No idea how this may play out.

From this example we see how the speaker tries to engage the audience into his speech, by simply asking them a question *(Good morning. How are you?)*, followed with a humorous element *(It's been great, hasn't it? I've been blown away by the whole thing. In fact, I'm leaving)* and eventually by the main points of his speech. First it is interesting to discuss how he creates the humorous element.

*I've been **blown away** by the whole thing. In fact, **I'm leaving***– In this case we have two frames. The verb *blown away* evokes *Detonate_explosive* frame and the verb form leaving evokes *Departing* frame. These two frames are not related by the subframe relationship. Humour is caused by the change in meaning through using *Departing* frame because in usual cases something that is interesting and

pleasant for the subject doesn't imply leaving the cause of pleasure behind. By creating laughter the speaker reduced the tension between himself and the audience and prepared the ground for the implementation of his main messages throughout the speech. What is the reason behind this sequence? The speaker intentionally creates, as Minsky (1974) calls it, an instantiated frame-pair of humour-seriousness. The reason for this is to create sharp contrast and therefore raise the level of sensitivity towards the issue in the audience.

Example 5.

The power of introverts

(https://www.ted.com/talks/susan_cain_the_power_of_introverts/transcript)

10:14 And groups famously follow the opinions of the most dominant or charismatic person in the room, even though there's zero correlation between being the best talker and having the best ideas -- I mean zero. So –

10:28 (Laughter)

10:30 You might be following the person with the best ideas, but you might not. And do you really want to leave it up to chance? Much better for everybody to go off by themselves, generate their own ideas freed from the distortions of group dynamics, and then come together as a team to talk them through in a well-managed environment and take it from there.

In this example we see the similar case of creating humourous elements and communicating the idea. The humorous element is introduced by the following sentence: there's zero correlation between being the best talker and having the best ideas -- I mean zero. Humour is resulted by the opposition of *performers_and_roles* frame with *Possession* frame. After creating laughter the speaker introduces the main idea of her speech:"*Much better for everybody to go off by themselves, generate their own ideas freed from the distortions of group dynamics, and then come together as a team to talk them through in a well-managed environment and take it from there.*" In this case again we have the instantiated frame-

pair of humour and seriousness with the aim to create emotional setting that will make the audience to be more sensitive towards the issue the speaker wants to communicate.

Example 6.

Beautiful new words to describe obscure emotions

(https://www.ted.com/talks/john_koenig_beautiful_new_words_to_describe_obscure_emotions/transcript)

03:47 And when people ask me, "Are these words real?" I had a variety of answers that I tried out. Some of them made sense. Some of them didn't. But one of them I tried out was, "Well, a word is real if you want it to be real." The way that this path is real because people wanted it to be there.

04:04 (Laughter)

04:06 It happens on college campuses all the time. It's called a "desire path."

04:09 (Laughter)

04:10 But then I decided, what people are really asking when they're asking if a word is real, they're really asking, "Well, how many brains will this give me access to?" Because I think that's a lot of how we look at language. A word is essentially a key that gets us into certain people's heads. And if it gets us into one brain, it's not really worth it, not really worth knowing. Two brains, eh, it depends on who it is. A million brains, OK, now we're talking. And so a real word is one that gets you access to as many brains as you can. That's what makes it worth knowing.

This example emphasises the way the speaker tries to communicate one of the main ideas of his speech – the meaning of words and possibilities that come with it - after using humorous elements*(The way that this path is real because people wanted it to be there)*created by opposing the *existence* frame with *desiring* frame, with the same purpose that the other two examples did.

5. Conclusions

The aim of this article was to study how speakers create humour for emotional settings in public speaking. The research showed that the humorous element was created by using non-related frames, the frames that do not reveal the subframe relationship. In the FrameNet project, subframe relationship is defined as the semantic interaction between frames, when one frame is more complex and its sequences of states and transitions can be separately described as a frame. (Ruppenhofer, J., Ellsworth, M., Petruck, M. R., Johnson, C. R., & Scheffczyk, J. 2016:83-84)

Public speeches provide great examples of how speakers use language to persuade and influence listeners into a certain way of seeing and perceiving things. The study has shown that humour can be the means of social interaction that prepares the ground for cultural framing and idea constructing.

As it was already mentioned, there is no such state as not experiencing any emotion at all. We are subconsciously always feeling some kind of emotion (Izard 1992). Because of this, public speakers need to first create a common emotional setting that is achieved by using humour. The next stage was connected to cultural framing. Because the listeners are considered to be members of one society, culture for them is the way to find common values. The speaker, therefore, tries to use these common values in order to construct a unified emotional state. As a result, the speaker and the listener share a common reality and mutually decode similar frames with similar meanings. As for the frames, speakers repeatedly used frame-pair of humour and seriousness. Creating contrast between two opposite emotional states made the audience more sensitive towards the issues speakers raised.

For the future study, it would be interesting to examine emotion as a discourse and based on the frame analysis framework, distinguish its social and cultural values specifically in the ways the gender issues emerge in public speaking. In addition, it would be interesting to explore whether there are lexical units that reveal a higher degree of emotional load. Hence, we could also ask questions about separate emotional categories of frames.

5. References

1. Beeman, W. (1999). Humour. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 9(1/2), 103-106. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.lez.tsu.edu.ge:2048/stable/43102438

2. Besnier, N. (1990). Language and Affect. Annual Review of Anthropology, 19, 419-451. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.lez.tsu.edu.ge:2048/stable/2155972

3. Cannon, W. (1987). The James-Lange Theory of Emotions: A Critical Examination and an Alternative Theory. The American Journal of Psychology, 100(3/4), 567-586. doi:10.2307/1422695

4. Cannon-Bard theory. (n.d.) Wikipedia.org. (2014). Retrieved June 19 2019 from https://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Cannon-Bard+theory

5. Entman, R. M. (1993), "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm." Journal of Communication, 43: 51–58. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

6. Fillmore, C. J. (October 01, 1976). FRAME SEMANTICS AND THE NATURE OF LANGUAGE. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 280, 20-32.

7. Izard, C. (1992). Basic emotions, relations among emotions, and emotion-cognition relations. Psychological Review, 99(3), 561-565. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.99.3.561

8. Izard, C. (2007). Basic Emotions, Natural Kinds, Emotion Schemas, and a New Paradigm. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2(3), 260-280. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40212206

9. James, W. (1884). What is an Emotion? Mind, 9(34), 188-205. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2246769

10. James-Lange theory of emotion. (n.d.) Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition 2014. (1991, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2014). Retrieved June 19 2019 from https://www.thefreedictionary.com/James-Lange+theory+of+emotion

11. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

12. Loseke, D. (2009). Examining Emotion as Discourse: Emotion Codes and Presidential Speeches Justifying War. The Sociological Quarterly, 50(3), 497-524. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.lez.tsu.edu.ge:2048/stable/40220142

13. Minsky. M (1974) A Framework for Representing Knowledge: MIT-AI Laboratory Memo 306, June, 1974. Reprinted in The Psychology of Computer Vision, P. Winston (Ed.), McGraw-Hill, 1975. Shorter versions in J. Haugeland, Ed., Mind Design, MIT Press, 1981, and in Cognitive Science, Collins, Allan and Edward E. Smith (eds.) Morgan-Kaufmann, 1992 ISBN 55860-013-2]

14. Moors, A. et al.(2013). Appraisal Theories of Emotion: State of the Art and Future Development. Emotion Review, 2013, vol. 5, no. 2, p. 119-124

15. P. N. Johnson-laird & Keith Oatley (1989) The language of emotions: An analysis of a semantic field, Cognition and Emotion, 3:2, 81-123, DOI: 10.1080/02699938908408075

16. Raskin, V. (1979, July). Semantic mechanisms of humor. In Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (Vol. 5, pp. 325-335).

17. Ruppenhofer, J., Ellsworth, M., Petruck, M. R., Johnson, C. R., & Scheffczyk, J. (2016). FrameNet II: Extended theory and practice. Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Bibliothek. Retrieved from: https://framenet2.icsi.berkeley.edu/docs/r1.7/book.pdf

18. Scherer, K. (2009). Emotions Are Emergent Processes: They Require a Dynamic Computational Architecture. Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences, 364(1535), 3459-3474. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.lez.tsu.edu.ge:2048/stable/40538140

19. Wierzbicka, A. (1986). Human Emotions: Universal or Culture-Specific? American Anthropologist, 88(3), new series, 584-594. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.lez.tsu.edu.ge:2048/stable/679478

20. Wierzbicka, A. (1999). Studies in emotion and social interaction: Second series. Emotions across languages and cultures: Diversity and universals. New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511521256

21. Wierzbicka, A., & Andor, J. (2009). Words in culture: An interview with Anna Wierzbicka. Acta Linguistica Hungarica, 56(2-3), 315-335. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/26190931

22. Zidjerveld, A. (1968). JOKES AND THEIR RELATION TO SOCIAL REALITY. Social Research, 35(2), 286-311. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40969908
23. Webpages: (Last visited: 05/26/2019)
   a. https://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/fndrupal/
   b. https://www.ted.com/#/
   c. https://www.thefreedictionary.com/

Author's email: Natia.Zardiashvili347@hum.tsu.edu.ge

Author's biographical data:

The author of the article is a PhD student at Javakhishvili State University, currently working in Cognitive linguistics on the issue of framing emotions in English public discourse. She has an extensive experience of teaching English to multi-level and exam-oriented classrooms. The author teaches at a language learning center in Tbilisi.